
From: Bailey Agent [mailto:agentmail@baileyproperties.com]

Sent: Monday, September 24, 2007 2:28 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: MLP-concerns

The Marine Protection Act is too strict for the benefit of what? Closing several of these areas for the benefit of scientific study allows the scientist and their crews to remain in business (usually there is an affiliation with an University who are taking grants as financial support) while taking away some of the best fishing areas in the state. Why couldn't they chooses areas along the coast where no take is already in affect due to poor accessibility? Why are they choosing areas where there is easy access? And why not stick to only the fish that are in need of protecting (most of which are already protected)?

So, I am no longer allowed to fish in many of these areas with my kids so some University program backed by the state and the subsequent affiliated staff can create job security. Great.

Thanks for creating a blue ribbon minefield for fisherman to navigate through..by the way, I am concerned there no end time for the California's Marine Life Protection Act. Surly, if these studies show fish stocks are ok closed areas should be reopened even if it means University staff will have to collect unemployment benefits.

Darren Houser
Santa Cruz Resident
Fisherman, while it's still legal

Realtordarren @yahoo.com